DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 095 TM 005 796

AUTHOR Goodwin, Judy; Lukshus, Anne M.
TITLE Follow Through Expansion Pre-Program Data, 1975. Report Number 7642.
INSTITUTION Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Oct 75
NOTE 42p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education Programs; *Educational Background; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Principals; *Program Attitudes; Questionnaires; Resource Teachers; Teacher Aides
IDENTIFIERS Pennsylvania (Philadelphia); Philadelphia Pennsylvania Public Schools; *Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

The Follow Through Expansion Program involved 46 schools in all eight districts of Philadelphia, Pa. The program was instituted at the kindergarten level in March, 1975. Five model options were proposed for implementation on the basis of previous evaluation findings regarding the original Follow Through Program in Philadelphia. Of these, four were selected by the participating schools: Option 1: a local adaption of the Behavior Analysis model, Option 2: a Behavior Analysis/ Bank Street combination, Option 3: a Behavior Analysis/ Bilingual combination not selected by the participating schools, Option 4: a local adaption of the Bank Street model, and Option 5: a Bank Street/ Bilingual combination. Pre-program questionnaires were completed by principals, resource teachers, teachers, and aides, and yielded background information on program personnel as well as pre-program attitudes. The majority of principals indicated that they were satisfied with the model assigned to them and that they expected Follow Through to have a strong effect on pupil achievement, parent participation, staff development and the motivation of instructional personnel. Sixty-seven percent of the teachers also evidenced positive reactions to the news of the expansion program. Option 4 teachers elicited the highest percentage of positive responses and Option 2 the lowest. Aides indicated increased clarity after training but somewhat lower enthusiasm, possibly due to previous training which emphasized a different instructional orientation at the kindergarten level. (Author/RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131095

FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION
PRE-PROGRAM DATA, 1975

October, 1975

Report Number 7642

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TM005 796

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

2

Office of Research and Evaluation
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION
PRE-PROGRAM DATA, 1975

October, 1975

Report Prepared by:

Judy Goodwin

Anne M. Lukshus

of the

Follow Through Evaluation Staff

Report Number 7642

Leontine D. Scott
Director
Follow Through Program

Thomas C. McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood Evaluation

Milton Goldberg
Executive Director
Early Childhood Programs

Irvin J. Farber
Assistant Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

Michael H. Kean
Executive Director
Office of Research and Evaluation

Office of Research and Evaluation
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

ABSTRACT

The Follow Through Expansion Program involves 46 schools in all eight districts. The program was instituted at the kindergarten level in March, 1975. Five model options were proposed for implementation on the basis of previous evaluation findings regarding the original Follow Through Program in Philadelphia. Of these, four were selected by the participating schools:- Option 1: a local adaption of the Behavior Analysis model, Option 2: a Behavior Analysis/Bank Street combination, Option 3: a Behavior Analysis/Bilingual combination not selected by the participating schools, Option 4: a local adaption of the Bank Street model and Option 5: a Bank Street/Bilingual combination.

Pre-program questionnaires were completed by principals (41), resource teachers (10), teachers (125) and aides (79). The questionnaires yielded background information on program personnel as well as pre-program attitudes. The majority of principals indicated that they were satisfied with the model assigned to them and that they expected Follow Through to have a strong effect on pupil achievement, parent participation, staff development and the motivation of instructional personnel. Sixty-seven percent of the teachers also evidenced positive reactions to the news of the expansion program. Option 4 teachers elicited the highest percentage of positive responses (84%) and Option 1 the lowest (49%). Aides indicated increased clarity after training but somewhat lower enthusiasm, possibly due to previous training which emphasized a different instructional orientation at the kindergarten level.

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation Goals

In an effort to collect baseline information on principals, teachers and aides in the 46 expansion program schools, the evaluation staff developed questionnaires (see appendix) which were completed by all concerned at the beginning of the program. In addition to items related to the background characteristics of the expansion program staff, some questions were directly aimed at determining what pre-program attitudes existed. Future evaluations will attempt to measure to what degree, if any, these initial attitudes undergo change as a function of program exposure.

Programmatic Features

Based on previous evaluation findings regarding the seven instructional models in the original Follow Through Program in Philadelphia, five different "options" (a term used in lieu of "model" by the local program administration staff) were selected for implementation in the expansion program:

Option 1: combines local adaptions of Behavior Analysis techniques with regular Behavior Analysis curriculum materials.

Option 2: combines local adaptions of the Behavior Analysis and Bank Street approaches.

Option 3: was proposed but not selected by any participating schools and was to be a Behavior Analysis/Bilingual combination.

Option 4: combines local adaptions of the Bank Street approach with most of the Bank Street materials.

Option 5: combines local adaptions of Bank Street techniques with Bilingual materials.

The 46 expansion program schools are in all eight districts. The breakdown by district is:

District 1: 6 schools - 20 classes (Options 1, 2 and 4)

District 2: 5 schools - 17 classes (Options 1, 2 and 4)

District 3: 8 schools - 16 classes (Options 1 and 5)

District 4: 7 schools - 17 classes (Option 1)

District 5: 8 schools - 19 classes (Options 1, 2, 4 and 5)

District 6: 5 schools - 19 classes (Options 2 and 4)

District 7: 5 schools - 17 classes (Options 1 and 4)

District 8: 2 schools - 8 classes (Option 4)

The report will successively focus on: I. Principal survey data, II. Resource Teachers, III. Teachers, and IV. Aides.

I. PRINCIPAL DATA

A pre-program questionnaire was sent to each of the 46 principals in the expansion schools; 41/46 principals returned completed questionnaires. The background information provided indicates that seventy-three percent of the principals are male and 27% are female. The majority (68%) are between the ages of 35 and 50. In terms of educational background, 83% have a master's degree and 30 additional credits. The range of years that the principals have been at their current schools is from two months to 11 years with a median of 4 years. The number of years experience as a principal ranges from 4 months to 17 years with a median of 6 years. Additional administrative experience ranged from 0 to 20 years with a median of 3 years.

When asked what their reaction was to the news that the Follow Through Program would be instituted at their schools, 88% responded in a positive manner, 7% gave a neutral response and 5% did not respond to this question. Most principals (34/41 or 83%) indicated that they were informed of the model options at a meeting, but only 19/41 (44%) actually had a choice in the model that would be implemented at their schools. Nevertheless, most principals indicated that they were satisfied with the model assigned to them, either because it was compatible with the District Reading Program and/or met the needs of children, teachers and parents. Of the 19 principals who had a choice of model, 11/19 consulted with their faculties in making the choice and 4/19 consulted with parents. However, almost all principals (38/41) indicated that they met with their faculties to inform them of the new program.

When asked (Table 1) to rate on a five-point scale how closely the model related to their belief about how children learn, 33/41 principals (81%) assigned a "1" or "2" rating (closely related), 5/41 (12%) assigned a "3" (neutral) rating and 3/41 (7%) did not respond. Sixty-six percent also indicated that they expected Follow Through would have a strong effect on pupil achievement, 73% expected the program to have a strong effect on parent participation, 71% on staff development and 66% on the motivation of instructional personnel.

In sum, the majority of principals in the expansion schools seem to regard the introduction of Follow Through to their schools as a program which will better meet the needs of children, teachers and parents and improve the quality of instruction.

Table 1

Ratings by Expansion Program Principals on Several Program Dimensions

Question		Positive 1	2	3	4	Negative 5
How closely is the model that is going to be implemented related to your belief about how children learn?	N	14	19	5	-	-
	%	37	50	13	-	-
What effect do you expect FT will have on Achievement?	N	9	18	9	-	-
	%	25	50	25	-	-
What effect do you expect FT will have on Parent Participation?	N	11	18	8	1	-
	%	29	47	21	3	-
What effect do you expect FT will have on Staff Development?	N	14	15	8	1	-
	%	37	39	21	3	-
What effect do you expect FT will have on Motivation of Instructional Personnel?	N	10	17	9	2	-
	%	26	45	24	5	-

II. RESOURCE TEACHER DATA

Ten resource teachers were appointed for the 1974-75 kindergarten expansion program. One resource teacher was assigned to each of Districts 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8 until additional resource teachers were hired, and two resource teachers were assigned to Districts 1 and 7, respectively. Their function is to provide staff development and support at the school sites in implementing the specific model options.

Pre-program teacher questionnaires were completed by all 10 resource teachers. Responses indicate that 9/10 are female, four are under 30 years of age and six are between the ages of 30 and 50. Six have at least a master's degree and the majority (9/10) have more than five years of teaching experience at the elementary level.

Responses to how resource teachers were informed about the expansion of Follow Through indicated that most had heard through a job flyer and applied for the position. When asked whether they had been assigned the model of their preference, six resource teachers indicated in the affirmative, three did not respond and one did not know. This may be due to the fact that at the time the questionnaire was administered, the assignments had not been finalized and specific model training had not taken place. Table 2 indicates the ratings that were made at two points in time, i.e., pre- and post-training. Post-training ratings evidenced greater differentiation and increased clarity about the models. The majority of resource teachers 9/10 also indicated that the model they would be working in was close to their teacher training experiences, and approximately 50% indicated that they had recently worked in a traditional classroom, whereas the other 50% had worked in an open setting.

Table 2

Pre-Post Training Ratings

		Positive				Negative
		1	2	3	4	5
		N	N	N	N	N
How clear are you about the specifics of the model you will be expected to implement?	Pre	-	6	4	-	-
	Post[a]	3	8	2	-	1
How enthusiastic are you about working in this model?	Pre	8	2	-	-	-
	Post[a]	8	6	-	-	-
How closely is this model related to your belief about how children learn?	Pre	4	4	2	-	-
	Post[a]	4	5	3	-	-

a. post-training figures reflect multiple ratings by some resource teacherr for different model options

III. TEACHER DATA

Pre-training questionnaires were distributed to 125 teachers. The major focus of the discussion which follows is based on the actual number of responses to each item. Where there is a notable discrepancy between the number of responses received and the total numbers of possible responses this fact will be noted.

a) Background Characteristics (Table 3)

With the exception of one male teacher in Option 1, all teachers are female. The majority in the total expansion program (66 teachers or 53%), as well as in most options, are between 30 and 50 years of age; 47 teachers (38%) are less than 30 years old, and 12 (10%) are over 50. Responding about their educational level, 92 teachers (75%) indicated they have a B.A. degree; 23 teachers (19%) attained the Master's level, and 8 teachers (7%) have gone beyond the Master's degree.

b) Experience (Table 3)

Only 16 teachers (13%) are without previous teaching experience. Twenty-four (19%) taught less than two years; 21 (17%) had between two and five years of teaching experience; 30 (24%) indicated between five and ten years of service, while 34 (27%) have been teaching more than ten years.

Over 40% (52 teachers) are new to the expansion school to which they have been assigned. The remaining teachers have had various amounts of experience at the expansion sites. Twenty teachers (16%) have worked less than two years; 16 (14%) spent between two and five years; 20 (16%) have been there between five and ten years; 18 (15%) have more than ten years of experience at the expansion sites.

Table 3

Teacher Background Characteristics

OPTION	SEX				AGE						EDUCATION						TOTAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE (YRS.)										EXPERIENCE AT PRESENT SCHOOL (YRS.)									
	M		F		-30		30-50		50+		BA		MA		MA+		0		-2		2-5		5-10		10+		0		-2		2-5		5-10		10+	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	1	2	54	98	23	42	28	51	4	7	41	75	12	22	2	4	6	11	12	22	9	16	13	24	15	27	25	45	8	15	4	7	7	13	11	20
2	0	0	12	100	3	25	8	67	1	8	10	91	1	9	0	0	1	8	4	33	2	17	2	17	3	25	3	25	3	25	3	25	2	17	1	8
4	0	0	52	100	18	35	28	54	6	12	36	71	9	18	6	12	9	17	6	12	7	13	15	29	15	29	24	47	6	12	5	10	11	22	5	10
5	0	0	6	100	3	50	2	33	1	17	5	83	1	17	0	0	0	0	2	33	3	50	0	0	1	17	0	0	3	50	2	33	0	0	1	17
Total	1	1	124	99	47	38	66	53	12	10	92	75	23	19	8	7	16	13	24	19	21	17	30	24	34	27	52	42	20	16	14	11	20	16	18	15

c) News of Expansion Program

Approximately 60% (74) of the respondents first heard of the program expansion between September and December, 1974. Another 31% were informed during January or February, 1975, while the remaining 7% were told during March. The majority of teachers (62%) were informed by their principals or supervisors, in most cases during a conversation, conference, or informal discussion. Some found out about the expansion through the Personnel Office, job flyer, or other printed announcement.

d) Reactions to Expansion Program

Table 4 presents a detailed summary, by option and by total program, of teacher reactions to news of the expansion. Across options, the responses were positive in 67% of the cases, neutral only 11% of the time, and negative for 22% of the teachers. Option 4 had the highest percentage of positive reactions (84%) and the smallest percentage of negative ones, while Option 1 had the smallest percentage (49%) of teachers with favorable responses.

Table 4

Reaction of Teachers to News of Expansion

Option	Positive		Neutral		Negative	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	25	49	9	18	17	33
2	9	75	0	0	3	25
4	41	84	4	8	4	8
5	4	67	0	0	2	33
Total	79	67	13	11	26	22

e) Degree of Teacher Input

All respondents in Options 2 and 5 indicated that the faculty had no voice in the decision to accept Follow Through at their schools, while only a few teachers in Options 1 and 4 responded that the faculty at their schools had any voice in the decision. As far as having any input in the choice of model, only 31% of the teachers who responded to the question (or 21% of the total N) answered in the affirmative. It should be noted that approximately one-third of the respondents did not answer the two questions relating to their input regarding decisions to accept Follow Through and the choice of model to be implemented. (See Table 5)

f) Model Preference

It should be noted that approximately one-third (N=40) of the total number of teachers did not respond to the question pertaining to all reporting of results is based on the responses of the 68% (N=85) of the teachers who expressed an opinion. As shown in Table 6, 88% of the respondents across all options indicated they preferred to work in their respective models. In Options 4 and 5 the responses were 100% positive, while yy and 70% of the teachers in Options 1 and 2, respectively, answered in the affirmative.

g) Relationship of Model to Teacher Training

Across all options, responses about the relationship of the model to teacher training were almost evenly divided among three categories: "closely related" ("1" and "2" ratings on a 1-to-5 continuum), neutral ("3" on the continuum), and "not at all related" ("4" and "5" ratings on the continuum). In Option 1 the neutral category drew the most responses, while in Option 4, 60% of the teachers found their model related to their training and only 10% considered it unrelated.

According to Table 7, 45% of all teachers indicated their recent experience took place in some form of traditional classroom setting

Table 5

Did Faculty Have A Voice in Choice of Model?

Option	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
1	6	17	29	83
2	1	11	8	89
4	18	51	17	49
5	1	17	5	83
Total	26	31	59	69

Table 6

Do You Prefer to Work in This Model?

Option	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
1	24	77	7	23
2	7	70	3	30
4	41	100	0	0
5	3	100	0	0
Total	75	88	10	12

Table 7

What Kind of Classroom Have You Recently Worked in?

Traditional	1		2		3		4		5	Open
Option	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	19	37	13	25	9	17	8	15	3	6
2	6	50	0	0	4	33	0	0	2	17
4	8	17	9	19	12	26	14	30	4	9
5	2	25	1	12.5	2	25	2	25	1	12.5
Total	35	27	23	18	37	29	24	19	10	8

("1" and "2" ratings on the 1-to-5 continuum on the questionnaire), 27% worked in an open classroom setting ("4" and "5" ratings on the continuum), while 29% responded with a "3" (a midway point between traditional and open classroom). Options 1 and 2 had the most teachers with traditional classroom experience (62 and 50%, respectively), while Options 4 and 5 had an equal distribution of traditional and open classroom teachers, averaging slightly less than 40% in each category.

h) Pre-post Training Responses

Questions about familiarity with the specifics of the model, enthusiasm, and beliefs about how children learn (Tables 8-10) appeared on both the pre- and post-training questionnaires. As a result, useful data on teacher attitudes before and after training were obtained. Each of the questions elicited more favorable responses following training, as will be noted in greater detail in the discussion which follows.

As shown in Table 8, clarity about the specifics of the model, ranging from 20 to 28% among the four options before training, increased considerably (56 to 71%) after training. Responses on the pre-training questionnaire showed only 23% of all teachers had some degree of clarity, 42% were neutral, while 34% were unclear. Post-training responses were much more positive with 61% leaning toward clarity, 28% remaining neutral, and only 12% remaining unclear.

Table 9 presents pre- and post-training data relating to teacher enthusiasm for the model to be implemented. While there was a slight (4%) overall increase in enthusiasm for all teachers from pre- to post-training, only Options 1 and 5 showed a similar pattern. For Option 4 there was no significant change when comparing pre- and post-training responses. In Option 2 the 83% pre-training rate dropped to 60% after training.

Table 8

How Clear Are You About The Specifics of The Model You Will be Expected to Implement?

Pre-Training Responses:

Ratings from 1 (Very Clear) to 5 (Totally Unclear).

Option	Very Clear 1		2		3		4		5 Totally Unclear	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	6	11	8	15	25	45	11	20	5	9
2	1	8	2	17	7	58	1	8	1	8
4	1	2	9	18	17	35	13	27	9	18
5	1	14	1	14	3	43	1	14	1	14
Total	9	7	20	16	52	42	26	21	16	13

Post-Training Responses:

Ratings from 1 (Very Clear) to 5 (Totally Unclear).

Option	Very Clear 1		2		3		4		5 Totally Unclear	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	6	12	28	54	16	31	2	4	0	0
2	0	0	7	64	1	9	3	27	0	0
4	8	15	22	41	16	30	6	11	2	4
5	0	0	5	71	1	14	1	14	0	0
Total	14	11	62	50	34	28	12	10	2	2

Table 9

How Enthusiastic Are You About Working in This Model?

Pre-Training Responses:

Ratings From 1 (Very Enthusiastic) to 5 (Not at All Enthusiastic).

Option	Very Enthusiastic 1		2		3		4		5 Not at All Enthusiastic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	20	36	12	22	16	29	4	7	3	5
2	6	50	4	33	0	0	1	8	1	8
4	24	48	12	24	11	22	2	4	1	2
5	2	33	2	33	2	33	0	0	0	0
Total	52	42	30	24	29	24	7	6	5	4

Post-Training Responses:

Ratings From 1 (Very Enthusiastic) to 5 (Not at All Enthusiastic).

Option	Very Enthusiastic 1		2		3		4		5 Not at All Enthusiastic	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	17	33	17	33	15	29	2	4	1	2
2	0	0	6	60	1	10	3	30	0	0
4	23	43	16	30	13	24	1	2	1	2
5	5	71	1	14	1	14	0	0	0	0
Total	45	37	40	33	30	24	6	5	2	2

Responses in answer to the question: "How closely is this model related to your belief about how childfen learn?" are presented in Table 10. On the pre-training questionnaire 67% of the teachers indicated a positive response, and the rate increased by 6 percentage points on the post-training questionnaire. Teachers in Options 2 and 4 had the most favorable responses (72 and 81% respectively) before training, while Option 1 had the least (55%). Considering the positive responses ("1" and "2" on the 1-to-5 continuum) after training in relation to pre-training, there was a 5% decrease for Option 1, no change for Option 2, and substantial increases for Option 4 and 5, the rate being 92 and 86%, respectively.

(i) Effectiveness of Training

The final question on the post-training questionnaire elicited ratings of the training sessions. The results are presented in Table 11 and show that 49% of all teachers found the training effective in meeting their needs. A neutral response was made by 34% of the respondents, while 17% considered the training ineffective. Differences in the effectiveness rating among the four options ranged from a high of 86% in Option 5 to a low of 36% in Option 2.

Table 10

How Closely is This Model Related to Your Belief About How Children Learn?

Pre-Training Responses:
Ratings from 1 (Closely Related) to 5 (Not At All Related).

Option	Closely Related 1		2		3		4		5 Not at All Related	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	10	19	19	36	20	38	3	6	1	2
2	4	36	4	36	3	27	0	0	0	0
4	13	32	20	49	5	12	2	5	1	2
5	3	50	1	17	2	33	0	0	0	0
Total	30	27	44	40	30	27	5	5	2	2

Post-Training Responses:
Ratings from 1 (Closely Related) to 5 (Not At All Related).

Option	Closely Related 1		2		3		4		5 Not at All Related	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	7	13	19	37	22	42	3	6	1	2
2	3	27	5	45	3	27	0	0	0	0
4	24	44	26	48	3	6	1	2	0	0
5	4	57	2	29	1	14	0	0	0	0
Total	38	31	52	42	29	23	4	3	1	1

Table 11

Effectiveness of Training:

Ratings from 1 (Very Effective) to 5 (Not At All Effective).

Option	Very Effective 1		2		3		4		5 Not at All Effective	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	7	13	20	38	18	35	7	13	0	0
2	1	9	3	27	5	45	2	18	0	0
4	9	17	15	28	18	33	12	22	0	0
5	2	29	4	57	1	14	0	0	0	0
Total	19	15	42	34	42	34	21	17	0	0

IV. AIDE DATA

Pre-program questionnaires were completed by 79 aides and post-training questionnaires by 87 aides. Table 12 provides information on the background characteristics of expansion program aides. Ninety-six percent are female, 77% are over 30 years of age, 61% have a 12th grade education and 68% live in the immediate community of the expansion school they are working in. Seventy-eight percent have had previous experience as classroom aides but the majority (94%) have never worked in a Follow Through classroom before.

Tables 13 and 14 represent pre- and post-training ratings assigned by aides to questions asking how clear they were about the model specifies they would be expected to implement, and how enthusiastic they were about the model. In the total program (pre 24%, post 57%) and in every option, a higher percentage of aides indicated increased clarity after training. However, in the total program, enthusiasm waned somewhat after training with 69% indicating high enthusiasm after training as opposed to 77% before training. With the exception of Option 5, the same holds true for each of the options, i.e., some decrease in enthusiasm seems to have taken place after training. One possible explanation is that the majority of aides (71%) were drawn from the Title I Kindergarten Aide Program where the instructional emphasis differed.

Table 15 represents the type of classroom the expansion program aides have recently worked in. Fifty-seven percent indicated that they had worked in a traditional classroom, while 20% had worked in an open setting. The remaining 23% had worked in a classroom somewhere between the two orientations. When asked to rate how effective the training sessions were in meeting their needs, the majority of aides (58%) assigned an effective rating, while only 6% indicated a low degree of effectiveness (see Table 16).

Table 12

Background Characteristics of Aides

Option	Sex		Age			Highest Level of Education			Do you live in the Immediate Community?		No. of yrs. as classroom aide			Have you worked in FT before?	
	male	female	under 30	30 to 50	over 50	9th to 12 Grade	12th Grade	Beyond High School	Yes	No	0	1-5	6-10	Yes	No
1	1	28	5	2	22	4	18	7	17	12	3	12	12	3	26
2	1	10	4	4	3	3	4	4	7	4	3	4	4	1	10
4	1	35	7	25	4	4	25	7	29	7	13	17	6	1	35
5	0	3	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	2	0	3
Total Program	3	76	18	31	30	12	48	19	54	25	16	34	24	5	74
Total Program Percentages	4	96	23	39	38	15	61	24	68	32	22	46	32	6	94

Table 13

Pre-Post Training Ratings

Question	Pre-Post Training	Option 1						Option 2						Option 4						Option 5					
		N	Very 1	2	3	4	Not at all 5	N	Very 1	2	3	4	Not at all 5	N	Very 1	2	3	4	Not at all 5	N	Very 1	2	3	4	Not at all 5
How clear are you about the specifics of the model you will be expected to implement?	Pre	29	6	3	17	3	0	10	0	2	5	1	2	36	2	6	15	5	8	3	0	0	1	0	2
	Post	29	5	9	12	2	1	7	0	2	5	0	0	45	5	21	15	4	0	4	0	1	2	1	0
How enthusiastic are you about working in this model?	Pre	29	21	4	4	0	0	10	4	3	3	0	0	36	21	5	8	1	1	3	2	0	1	0	0
	Post	29	13	8	7	1	0	7	1	2	4	0	0	47	23	9	14	1	0	4	2	2	0	0	0

Table 14

Pre-Post Training - Percentages of Those Who Assigned "1" or "2" Positive Ratings

Question	Pre-Post Training	Option 1		Option 2		Option 4		Option 5		Total Program	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
How clear are you about the specifics of the model you will be expected to implement?	Pre	9	31	2	20	8	22	0	0	19	24
	Post	14	48	2	29	26	58	1	25	43	57
How enthusiastic are you about working in this model?	Pre	25	86	7	70	26	72	2	67	60	77
	Post	21	72	3	43	32	68	4	100	60	69

Table 15

What Kind of Classroom Have You Recently Worked In?

Option	TRADITIONAL 1	2	3	4	OPEN 5
1	18	1	4	3	1
2	5	0	2	1	1
4	11	3	9	1	7
5	2	0	1	0	0
Total Program	36	4	16	5	9
Total Program Percentages	51	6	23	7	13

Table 16

How Effective Were The Training Sessions In Meeting Your Needs?

Option	VERY EFFECTIVE 1	2	3	4	NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE 5
1	6	12	10	1	0
2	0	1	5	1	0
4	12	15	17	3	0
5	1	3	0	0	0
Total Program	19	31	32	5	0
Total Program Percentages	22	36	37	6	0

SUMMARY

Forty-one of the forty-six principals, ten resource teachers, one hundred and twenty-five teachers and seventy-nine aides provided the information for this report. Background characteristics of expansion program principals indicate that two-thirds are male, most are between 35 and 50 years of age and most are educated well beyond the Master's degree level. The median number of years principals have been at their current school is four, while the median experience as a principal is six years with three years of additional administrative experience. Resource teachers, on the other hand, are predominantly female, all are between 25 and 50 years of age and have a Bachelor's degree or higher. Most have also had at least five years of teaching experience. Teachers, too, are predominantly female, between 30 and 50 years of age and have a B.A. degree or higher. Very few (13%) are without previous teaching experience. With regard to aides, most are female, the majority are over 30 years of age and have at least a 12th grade education. Sixty-eight percent live in the immediate community of the school they are working in and 78% have had previous experience in the classroom.

In terms of attitudes toward the expansion program, the majority of principals indicated that they were satisfied with the model assigned to them and that they expected Follow Through to have a strong effect on pupil achievement, parent participation, staff development and the motivation of instructional personnel. Sixty-seven percent of the teachers also evidenced positive reactions to the news of the expansion program. Option 4 teachers elicited the highest percentage of positive responses (84%) and Option 1 the lowest (49%). Similarly, Option 4 teachers felt their model was more closely

related to their beliefs about how children learn (92%) than Option 1 teachers (50%) as measured by the post-training questionnaire. Aides indicated increased clarity after training (pre 24%, post 57%) but somewhat lower enthusiasm (pre 77%, post 69%). This may be due to the fact that 71% of the aides were drawn from the Title I Kindergarten Aide Program, where the instructional emphasis differed.

APPENDIX

PRE-PROGRAM PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Expansion School _____

Model Option _____

1. Sex Male _____
   Female _____

2. Age Under 35 _____
   35-50 _____
   Over 50 _____

3. Level of Education
   MA _____
   MA + 30 _____
   Doctorate _____

4. How many years have you been principal of this school? _____ years

5. Years of experience as a principal _____ years

6. Years of experience in some other administrative capacity
   _____ years

7. Years of experience as a teacher _____ years

8. When did you first hear that your school was being considered as part of the expansion of Follow Through?
   Month _____ Year _____

9. Who informed you?
   Title of person _____

10. How were you informed?

telephone ☐

letter ☐

meeting ☐

Other, Please specify _____

_____

11. What was your reaction to this information? _____

_____

_____

Please explain your reasons: _____

_____

_____

_____

12. Were you informed of the different model options?

Yes _____ No _____

Please explain how you were informed: _____

_____

_____

_____

13. Did <u>you</u> have a choice in the model that will be implemented at your school? Yes _____ No _____

Please explain: _____

_____

_____

_____

14. If you had a choice was your faculty consulted in making this choice? Yes _____ No _____

Please explain: _____

_____

_____

15. Were parents consulted in making the choice? Yes____ No____

Please explain: _____

_____

_____

16. What were the primary reasons for the choice?

_____

_____

_____

_____

17. How closely is the model that is going to be implemented related to your belief about how children learn? (Circle one number on scale)

CLOSELY RELATED NOT AT ALL RELATED

1 2 3 4 5

18. Did you take any steps to prepare your faculty for the introduction of Follow Through to your school? Yes____No____

Please explain: _____

_____

_____

_____

19. What administrative changes do you anticipate with the i troduction of Follow Through to your school? (e.g., staffing, budget, materials, etc.) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

20. What effect do you expect Follow Through will have at your school in the following areas? (Circle one number only)

	GREAT EFFECT				NO EFFECT
1. Achievement	1	2	3	4	5
2. Parent Participation	1	2	3	4	5
3. Staff Development	1	2	3	4	5
4. Motivation of Instructional Personnel	1	2	3	4	5
5. Administrative Burden	1	2	3	4	5

21. Additional Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

PRE-PROGRAM TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Expansion School _____

1. Sex Male _____

   Female _____

2. Age Under 30 _____

   30-50 _____

   Over 50 _____

3. What is the highest level of school you completed?

   BA _____

   MA _____

   MA+ _____

4. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

   (a) Years

   0 _____

   Less than 2 _____

   2-5 _____

   5-10 _____

   More than 10 _____

   (b) Grades taught during this time.

   Kg. _____

   1st _____

   2nd _____

   3rd _____

   Other, please specify _____

5. How many years have you taught at this particular school?

   0 _____

   Less than 2 _____

   2-5 _____

   5-10 _____

   More than 10 _____

POST-TRAINING TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Expansion School _____

1. What model are you going to be working in? (Check one).

   Option 1 _____

   Option 2 _____

   Option 3 _____

   Option 4 _____

   Option 5 _____

2. At this point in time, how clear are you about the specifics of the model you will be expected to implement? (Circle one number on scale).

   VERY CLEAR — TOTALLY UNCLEAR

   1 2 3 4 5

3. At this point in time, how enthusiastic are you about working in this model?

   VERY ENTHUSIASTIC — NOT AT ALL ENTHUSIASTIC

   1 2 3 4 5

4. How closely is this model related to your belief about how children learn?

   CLOSELY RELATED — NOT AT ALL RELATED

   1 2 3 4 5

5. How effective were the training sessions in meeting your needs?

   VERY EFFECTIVE — NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE

   1 2 3 4 5

12. Is this the model you prefer to work in? Yes___No___

Explain: _____

13. At this point in time, how clear are you about the specifics of the model you will be expected to implement? (Circle one number on scale),

VERY CLEAR — TOTALLY UNCLEAR

1 2 3 4 5

14. At this point in time, how enthusiastic are you about working in this model?

VERY ENTHUSIASTIC — NOT AT ALL ENTHUSIASTIC

1 2 3 4 5

15. How closely is this model related to your teacher training?

CLOSELY RELATED — NOT AT ALL RELATED

1 2 3 4 5

16. How closely is this model related to your belief about how children learn?

CLOSELY RELATED — NOT AT ALL RELATED

1 2 3 4 5

17. What kind of classroom have you recently worked in?

TRADITIONAL — OPEN CLASSROOM

1 2 3 4 5

18. What steps, if any, have you taken since you first heard about your involvement in Follow Through to prepare yourself? (e.g., readings in the area; classroom observations; discussions, etc.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. When did you first hear about the expansion of Follow Through?

_____

_____

7. Who informed you?

_____

_____

8. How were you informed? (e.g., at a faculty meeting; through a memorandum; through a job flyer?)

_____

_____

_____

9. What was your reaction to this information?

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Did your faculty have any voice in:

a) the decision to accept Follow Through at your school? Yes___ No___

Explain what happened: _____

_____

_____

b) the choice of model at your school? Yes _____ No _____

Explain what happened: _____

_____

_____

11. What model are you going to be working in? (Check one)

Option 1 _____

Option 2 _____

Option 3 _____

Option 4 _____

Option 5 _____

PRE-PROGRAM AIDE QUESTIONNAIRE

Expansion School _____

1. Sex Male _____
   Female _____

2. Age Under 30 _____
   30-50 _____
   Over 50 _____

3. What is the highest level of school you have completed?
   (Check one) Elementary _____
   High School
   9th Grade _____
   10th Grade _____
   11th Grade _____
   12th Grade _____
   Beyond High School _____

4. Do you live in the immediate community of the school you will be working in? Yes _____ No _____

5 How many years have you worked as a classroom aide? _____ years

6. What grades did you work with during this time? _____

7. Have you ever worked in a Follow Through classroom before?
   Yes _____ No _____

8. If yes, in which model? _____

9. Which model will you be working in?

Option 1 _____

Option 2 _____

Option 3 _____

Option 4 _____

Option 5 _____

10. At this point in time, how clear are you about the specifics of the model you will be expected to implement? (Circle one number on scale)

VERY CLEAR — TOTALLY UNCLEAR

1 2 3 4 5

11. At this point in time, how enthusiastic are you about working in this model?

VERY ENTHUSIASTIC — NOT AT ALL ENTHUSIASTIC

1 2 3 4 5

12. What kind of classroom have you recently worked in?

TRADITIONAL — OPEN CLASSROOM

1 2 3 4 5

13. What do you think your duties will be as a classroom aide in Follow Through?

_____

_____

_____

_____

POST-TRAINING AIDE QUESTIONNAIRE

Expansion School _____

1. What model are you going to be working in? (Check one).

   Option 1 _____

   Option 2 _____

   Option 3 _____

   Option 4 _____

   Option 5 _____

2. At this point in time, how clear are you about the specifics of the model you will be expected to implement? (Circle one number on scale).

   VERY CLEAR TOTALLY UNCLEAR

   1 2 3 4 5

3. At this point in time, how enthusiastic are you about working in this model?

   VERY ENTHUSIASTIC NOT AT ALL ENTHUSIASTIC

   1 2 3 4 5

4. How effective were the training sessions in meeting your needs?

   VERY EFFECTIVE NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE

   1 2 3 4 5

5. What duties will you be required to perform as an aide in this model? _____